

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response to non-final Office Action is being submitted in response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 17, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-16, 18 and 20 are pending in the Application. Claims 1 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,250). Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, and 18 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,250) in view of Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,464).

In response to these rejections, Claims 1, 3, and 16 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, without prejudice or disclaimer to continued examination on the merits. These amendments are fully supported in the Specification, Drawings, and Claims of the Application and no new matter has been added. Based upon the amendments, reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejection of Claim 1 & 20 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) – Lin et al.:

Claims 1 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,250).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a network system wherein *et alia*, the internal configuration database process utilizes assigned process identification numbers for flexible naming of said network device that allows applications to use data in the configuration database to determine the names of other applications and configurable objects, such that re-start or upgrade of said network device or one of said plurality of modular processes is transparent to other said plurality of modular processes, with the exception of being notified of new process identification numbers. Support for the new limitation can be found on pages 30-35 of the Application as filed. Claim 20 depends from claim 1.

Lin et al. is generally directed to a system for managing a set of interconnected network elements (NE) that employs a network management system (NMS) for monitoring the network elements. Lin et al. indicate that each NE periodically communicates with NMS to report status data updates, where the timing and the content of the updates are determined based on a policy negotiated between the NMS and each NE.

Lin et al. do not teach or suggest the flexible naming of network device such that re-start or upgrade of a network device or one of a plurality of modular processes would be transparent to other said plurality of modular processes. Lin et al. therefore do not teach or suggest all of the features of the system of claim 1, and their concomitant advantages, such as more efficient synchronization of an external configuration database with a corresponding internal database. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 29-31 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) –

Lin et al. and Krishnamurthy et al.:

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, and 18 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,405,250) in view of Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,464).

As discussed above, Lin et al. do not teach the flexible naming of network device such that re-start or upgrade of a network device or one of a plurality of modular processes would be transparent to other said plurality of modular processes. Krishnamurthy et al. do not cure the shortcomings of Lin et al. in this regard. In particular, Krishnamurthy et al. disclose a system for managing devices from multiple vendors by employing a single network manager. The system includes an integrated site server having a plurality of ports for connection to devices to be managed. A user, e.g., a system manager, can communicate remotely, e.g., via a browser, with the site server to configure the site server to manage a device of interest, e.g., via an SNMP agent residing on the site server. In addition, the managed devices can also be configured to return information relating to selected operating parameters to the site server.

Krishnamurthy et al. do not teach the flexible naming of network device such that re-start or upgrade of a network device or one of a plurality of modular processes would be transparent to other said plurality of modular processes.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, and 18 are patentable over the combined teachings of the cited references. Withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant would like to thank Examiner for the attention and consideration accorded the present Application. Should Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place the Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact undersigned Counsel at the telephone number, facsimile number, address, or email address provided below. It is not believed that any fees for additional claims, extensions of time, or the like are required beyond those that may otherwise be indicated in the documents accompanying this paper. However, if such additional fees are required, Examiner is encouraged to notify undersigned Counsel at Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 25, 2005



Christopher L. Bernard
Registration No.: 48,234
Attorney for Applicant

DOUGHERTY, CLEMENTS, HOFER, BERNARD & WALKER
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211 USA
Telephone: 704.366.6642
Facsimile: 704.366.9744
cbernard@worldpatents.com